



#11
nzw

PTO/SB/83 (03-02)
Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0035
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL AS ATTORNEY OR AGENT

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Application Number | 10/029,951 |
| Filing Date | December 31, 2001 |
| First Named Inventor | Zhen-Man LIN |
| Group Art Unit | 3644 |
| Examiner Name | Mr. Tien Quang Dinh |
| Attorney Docket Number | GIA 117 |

To: Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

I hereby apply to withdraw as attorney or agent for the above identified patent application.

The reasons for this request are: See attached page.

RECEIVED
DEC 05 2002
GROUP 3600

- ☐ The correspondence address is NOT affected by this withdrawal.
- ☒ Change the correspondence address and direct all future correspondence to:

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS

☐ Customer Number

OR

☒ Firm or
Individual Name

Mr. Zhen-Man Lin

Address

Blk. C-4, 13/F, Wing Hing Industrial Bldg.,

Address

Hing Yip Street, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

City

Hong Kong

State

ZIP

Country

Peoples' Republic of China

Telephone

(852) 23440137

Fax

(852) 23419016

☒ This request is made on behalf of myself and

☒ all the attorneys/agents of record,

☐ the attorneys/agents (with registration numbers) listed on the attached paper(s), or

☐ the attorneys/agents associated with Customer Number _____

This request is enclosed in triplicate (including any attachments).

Name

Allen Wood, Reg. No. 28,134

Signature

Date

December 4, 2002

NOTE: Withdrawal is effective when approved rather than when received.

Unless there are at least 30 days between approval of withdrawal and the expiration date of a time period for response or possible extension period, the request to withdraw is normally disapproved.

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

FEES ENCLOSED: \$
Please charge any further
fees to our Deposit Account

Attachment to Form PTO/SB/83

This application (number 10/029,951, filed December 31, 2002) was filed by the firm of Rabin & Berdo, P.C., acting on behalf of the inventor via an IP firm in Taiwan. Rabin & Berdo received an Office Action dated August 14, 2002 and duly reported it to the Taiwanese IP firm. Rabin & Berdo received instructions for responding to the Office Action from the Taiwanese IP firm on or about October 14. The instructions included numerous pages of comments, apparently drafted by the inventor and later translated into English, and requested that a draft amendment be prepared and sent to the Taiwanese IP firm.

A draft amendment was prepared by a patent attorney at Rabin & Berdo and sent to the Taiwanese IP firm on or about October 25. It included a substitute specification, claim revisions, proposed drawing changes, and responses to the rejections and objections in the Office Action. On or about November 4, Rabin & Berdo received instructions for extensive changes that were demanded by the inventor. Although many of these changes seemed to be of questionable wisdom to the Rabin & Berdo attorney, a revised draft amendment was prepared and sent to the Taiwanese IP firm on November 13. Since the due-date for responding to the Office Action was November 14, the Taiwanese IP firm was advised that Rabin & Berdo would obtain an extension of time at no cost to the client if necessary. However, on November 14 the Taiwanese IP firm reported that the inventor said that he responded himself. Subsequent telephone calls to the Examiner revealed that a response had indeed been timely received by the PTO on November 13, 2002.

It is doubtful that the firm of Rabin & Berdo, and the attorneys therein (including two who are listed in the power of attorney but who are no longer with the firm), can be effective in its representation of an inventor who seeks to communicate directly with the PTO. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this request to withdraw should be granted.

The address, telephone number, and fax number of the inventor, as set forth on the Form PTO/SB/83, are believed to be correct. If not, we would be happy to provide the address of the Taiwanese IP firm, which may have better information.